REMARKS

Applicants have now had an opportunity to carefully consider the Examiner's comments set forth in the Office Action of October 2, 2007.

Reconsideration of the Application is requested.

The Office Action

Claims 1, 3-8 and 15-24 remain in this application. Claims 1 and 15 are currently amended. Claims 9-14 are currently canceled. Claims 22-24 are new.

Prosecution has been reopened in view of the Appeal Brief filed May 29, 2007.

Claims 1-21 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Daniel et al. (U.S. Patent No. 7,171,372) or Abdel-Malek et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,959,235) or Moskowitz et al. (U.S. Patent No. 6,339,736).

Claims 1, 3-8 and 21 not Anticipated by the Cited References

The present Office Action rejects claim 1 as being anticipated by Daniel et al. (hereinafter referred to as Daniel) or Abdel-Malek et al. (hereinafter referred to as Abdel-Malek) or Moskowitz et al. (hereinafter referred to as Moskowitz). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection and discuss each reference individually below.

Briefly, Daniel discloses a computerized method and system for guiding personnel servicing equipment requiring repair while at an equipment work site. The present application teaches a system that is specifically designed to analyze and diagnose the company's product(s) and then order the part(s) needed to be replaced. The Office Action cites Fig. 1 of Daniel as showing each of the recited limitations of claim 1 of the present application without further describing where the Daniel reference describes or teaches the limitations recited in the subject claim. While Fig. 1 of Daniel might show a system capable of incorporating the recited limitations of claim 1, i.e., a machine being serviced, a local computing device, and a host computing device, Applicants submit that Daniel does not teach concepts of the present application and, in particular, does not teach each of the recited limitations of claim 1, as amended.

Claim 1 recites a limitation such that "when the part is included as a non-replaceable component in a replaceable sub-assembly within the machine, the identifying step further includes, identifying the part as the sub-assembly." Daniel is

9

directed to a system for guiding personnel servicing equipment and, as such, includes aids for identifying parts. For example, it describes an Internet web page which may include links to pages containing drawings of component parts, specifications, or operating and repair manuals or other design parameters (col. 7, lines 24-31). Daniel also describes displaying information on a portable unit including a pictorial view of the locomotive and its constituent parts, repair steps, technical documentation relevant to the repair, and the tools necessary to perform the repair (col. 8, lines 63-67). Daniel further describes a recommendation authoring system which provides search criteria for retrieving relevant documentation. Included within the search criteria are one or more of the following: part name, part number, action name, repair fault code, and locomotive model (col. 11, lines 51-56). Daniel still further describes indices which can support identification of all documentation pages related to a specific part number, a specific part name, or a repair process name. Stored documents include: parts catalogs, wiring and parts schematics, maintenance manuals, fault analysis pages, back shop manuals, field modifications instructions, training instructions, part identification animations, assembly animations, etc. (col. 12, lines 46-54). However, the Office Action does not show where Daniel teaches or suggests identifying a part as the sub-assembly when the part is included as a non-replaceable component in a replaceable sub-assembly within the machine as recited in claim 1 of the present application.

Additionally, claim 1, as amended, recites limitations for determining if retrofit information is stored on the host computing device for the part identifier, and replacing the part identifier with an updated part identifier stored on the host computing device if the retrofit information is stored on the host computing device for the part identifier. Although Daniel, as discussed above, describes aids to locating parts in need of repair or replacement, including drawings, pictorial views, parts catalogs part identification animations, and even a search for a specific part number (see previous paragraph), the Office Action does not show where Daniel teaches or suggests replacing a part identifier with an updated part identifier stored on the host computing device if retrofit information is stored on the host computing device for the part identifier as recited in claim 1, as amended.

With reference now to the Abdel-Malek reference, Abdel-Malek discloses a diagnosis and repair recommendation system for a railroad locomotive. As with the Daniel reference, the Office Action cites Fig. 1 of Abdel-Malek as showing each of

the recited limitations of claim 1 without further describing where the reference describes or teaches the limitations recited in the subject claim. While Fig. 1 of Abdel-Malek might likewise show a system capable of incorporating the recited limitations of claim 1, Applicants submit that Abdel-Malek does not teach concepts of the present application and, in particular, does not teach each of the recited limitations of claim 1, as amended.

Reference is again made to the limitation of claim 1 wherein, when the part is included as a non-replaceable component in a replaceable sub-assembly within the machine, the identifying step further includes, identifying the part as the sub-assembly. Reference is also made again to the recited limitation of claim 1, as amended, for determining if retrofit information is stored on the host computing device for the part identifier, and replacing the part identifier with an updated part identifier stored on the host computing device if the retrofit information is stored on the host computing device for the part identifier. Abdel-Malek, being directed to a system for diagnosis and repair recommendation system for a railroad locomotive, includes aids for isolating problems to a specific part (col. 8, lines 30-33). Abdel-Malek describes parts catalogs (col. 7, lines 28-29) and, e.g., a repair information vault which includes acronyms and part numbers linked to an applicable catalog (col. 9, lines 39-51). The Abdel-Malek also includes a parts-ordering module which also provides aids for a technician to pick a specific part without knowledge of a part number (col. 10, lines 7-47). However, <u>the Office Action does not show where Abdel-Malek teaches or suggests identifying a part as the sub-assembly when the part is included as a non-replaceable component in a replaceable sub-assembly within the machine</u> as recited in claim 1 of the present application. Nor does the Office Action <u>show where Abdel-Malek teaches or suggests replacing a part identifier with an updated part identifier stored on the host computing device if retrofit information is stored on the host computing device for the part identifier</u> as recited in claim 1, as amended.

With reference now to the Moskowitz reference, Moskowitz discloses a system for the distribution of services to a vehicle. Again, as with the Daniel reference, the Office Action cites Fig. 1 of Moskowitz as showing each of the recited limitations of claim 1 without further describing where the reference describes or teaches the limitations recited in the subject claim. While Fig. 1 of Moskowitz might again show a system capable of incorporating the recited limitations of claim 1,

Applicants submit that Moskowitz does not teach concepts of the present application and, in particular, does not teach each of the recited limitations of claim 1, as amended.

Reference is made yet again to the limitation of claim 1 wherein, when the part is included as a non-replaceable component in a replaceable sub-assembly within the machine, the identifying step further includes, identifying the part as the sub-assembly. Reference is also made again to the recited limitation of claim 1, as amended, for determining if retrofit information is stored on the host computing device for the part identifier, and replacing the part identifier with an updated part identifier stored on the host computing device if the retrofit information is stored on the host computing device for the part identifier. Moskowitz briefly describes a service desk which orders parts (col. 3, lines 18-23) and briefly teaches that a dealer may be called upon by the service center to provide parts, however, the Moskowitz reference appears to be silent on the subject of part numbers or part identifiers. The Moskowitz reference also appears to be silent on the subject of sub-assemblies or components thereof. Applicants respectfully submit therefore that <u>the Office Action does not show where Moskowitz teaches or suggests identifying a part as the sub-assembly when the part is included as a non-replaceable component in a replaceable sub-assembly within the machine</u> as recited in claim 1 of the present application. Nor does the Office Action <u>show where Moskowitz teaches or suggests replacing a part identifier with an updated part identifier stored on the host computing device if retrofit information is stored on the host computing device for the part identifier</u> as recited in claim 1, as amended.

For at least the above-stated reasons, Applicants submit that the Daniel, Abdel-Malek and Moskowitz references, either alone or in combination, do not teach, suggest, or fairly disclose each and every element of independent claim 1, as amended. Applicants respectfully submit, therefore, that independent claim 1 of the present application, as amended, is patentably distinct over the cited references and in condition for allowance. Being that claims 3-8 and 21 depend from claim 1 and recite additional limitations which serve to further distinguish these claims over the cited references, Applicants submit that these claims are also in condition for allowance.

Claims 15 and 16-20 not Anticipated by the Cited References

The present Office Action also rejects claim 15 as being anticipated by Daniel or Abdel-Malek or Moskowitz. Again, the Office Action does not appear to discuss claim 15 specifically, however, Applicants assume that the Office Action is again applying the arguments directed to independent claim 1 to claim 15 as well because claim 15 recites similar limitations with regard to retrofit information.

More specifically, claim 15, as amended, recites a limitation for "a processor within the host computing device for determining if retrofit information for the part is stored on the storage device and ensuring the part is current in accordance with the stored retrofit information, the processor identifying the part as an updated part if the part is not current based on the stored retrofit information and transmitting an order for the part from the host computing device to an order processing center." Applicants respectfully submit therefore that the arguments set forth above with respect to independent claim 1, particularly regarding retrofit information, apply as well to independent claim 15, as amended. And for at least these reasons, Applicants submit that the Daniel, Abdel-Malek and Moskowitz references, either alone or in combination, do not teach, suggest, or fairly disclose each and every element of independent claim 15, as amended. Applicants respectfully submit therefore that independent claim 15 of the present application, as amended, is patentably distinct over the cited references and in condition for allowance.

Dependent claim 16 includes a limitation which recites: "if the part is included as a non-replaceable component in a replaceable sub-assembly within the machine, the part being identified as the sub-assembly." Applicants respectfully submit therefore that the arguments set forth above with respect to independent claim 1 regarding identifying the parg as a sub-assembly, apply as well to dependent claim 16. And for at least these reasons, Applicants submit that the Daniel, Abdel-Malek and Moskowitz references, either alone or in combination, do not teach, suggest, or fairly disclose each and every element of dependent claim 16. Applicants respectfully submit therefore that dependent claim 16 of the present application is patentably distinct over the cited references and in condition for allowance.

Additionally, being that claims 17-20 depend from claim 15 and recite additional limitations which serve to further distinguish these claims over the cited references, Applicants submit that these claims are also in condition for allowance.

Claims 22-24

New claims 22-24 recite additional novel features of the present application which are distinguished over the references of record.

Prior Art Made of Record and not Relied Upon

Other references considered pertinent to the applicant's disclosure and made of record, but not relied upon by the Examiner, have been reviewed by the applicants. The applicants submit that these references alone or in combination do not teach the present invention.